

1 JOSEPH H. HUNT  
Assistant Attorney General  
2 ALEXANDER K. HAAS  
Branch Director  
3 ERIC J. SOSKIN  
Senior Trial Counsel  
4 KERI L. BERMAN  
KUNTAL V. CHOLERA  
5 JOSHUA M. KOLSKY, DC Bar No. 993430  
Trial Attorneys  
6 United States Department of Justice  
7 Federal Programs Branch  
8 *Attorneys for Defendants*

9  
10 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON**  
11 **AT RICHLAND**

12 STATE OF WASHINGTON, *et al.*,

13 Plaintiffs,

14 v.

15 UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF  
16 HOMELAND SECURITY, *et al.*,

17 Defendants

No. 4:19-cv-5210-RMP

REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION  
TO EXPEDITE DEFENDANTS'  
MOTION FOR STAY OF  
INJUNCTION PENDING APPEAL

11/8/2019  
Without Oral Argument

20  
21  
22  
REPLY IN SUPP. OF MOTION TO EXPEDITE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
1100 L St. NW, Washington, DC, 20003  
(202) 305-7664

1 Plaintiffs' Opposition to Defendants' Motion for Expedited Hearing fails to  
2 meaningfully rebut Defendants' showing that good cause exists to expedite the hearing  
3 on Defendants' Motion for Stay of Injunction Pending Appeal. The core of Plaintiffs'  
4 opposition is that Defendants have not yet filed motions to expedite in the other similar  
5 lawsuits pending in other jurisdictions. But that is irrelevant to whether good cause exists  
6 to expedite Defendants' motion here. Each district has its own unique local rules and  
7 practices relating to scheduling hearings and adjudicating motions, and Defendants  
8 therefore made appropriate District-specific determinations about how best to proceed in  
9 each case. This District requires nondispositive motions to be set for hearing not less  
10 than 30 days after the date the motion is filed, *see* Local Rule 7(i)(2)(a), which could  
11 delay a decision past when it might be made in a similar case pending in a jurisdiction  
12 without such requirement. Moreover, unlike some other jurisdictions, this District's  
13 Local Rules include a commonly used mechanism for expediting a hearing upon a  
14 showing of good cause. *See* Local Rule 7(i)(2)(C). In any event, Defendants are in the  
15 process of seeking prompt rulings on their motions to stay filed in other jurisdictions.  
16 *See, e.g., Cook County, Illinois v. McAleenan*, No. 19-cv-06334, ECF No. 101 (N.D. Ill.  
17 Nov. 6, 2019) (Defendants' notice of waiver of reply and hearing on motion to stay  
18 preliminary injunction pending appeal); *City and County of San Francisco, v. U.S.*  
19 *Citizenship and Immigration Services*, Case No. 19-cv-04717-PJH, ECF No. 127, at 2  
20 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 7, 2019) (stating Defendants' position that a hearing on Defendants'  
21 motion to stay preliminary injunction pending appeal is unnecessary); *California* *v.*  
22 *Dep't of Homeland Security*, No. 19-4975, ECF No. 132, at 2-3 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 7, 2019)

REPLY IN SUPP. OF MOTION TO EXPEDITE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
1100 L St. NW, Washington, DC, 20003  
(202) 305-7664

1 (same); *La Clinica De La Raza v. Trump*, No. 19-cv-4980 ECF No. 137, at 2-3 (N.D.  
2 Cal.) (same).

3 Next, Plaintiffs' suggestion that Defendants delayed in filing their motion to stay  
4 is incorrect. Defendants filed that motion just two weeks after the Court entered its  
5 preliminary injunction – an appropriate amount of time for Defendants to review all six  
6 opinions entering preliminary injunctions in the various jurisdictions (collectively  
7 comprising hundreds of pages), draft stay motions, and obtain necessary authorizations  
8 to appeal. Also, during the brief interim between the filing of Defendants' motion to stay  
9 and their motion to expedite, Defendants' counsel was conferring with Plaintiffs' counsel  
10 in an attempt to reach agreement on an expedited schedule.

11 Plaintiffs also argue against expedited treatment based on their belief that  
12 Defendants have not shown irreparable harm. Opp'n at 5-6. Although Defendants  
13 strongly disagree for the reasons set forth in their motion to stay, the good cause standard  
14 applicable to the instant motion differs from the irreparable harm standard applicable to  
15 Defendants' motion to stay. The harms described in Defendants' motion to stay easily  
16 constitute good cause for expedited treatment, whether or not the Court agrees that those  
17 harms justify a stay. Good cause exists also because the Court has already ruled on  
18 Plaintiffs' motion for preliminary injunction and conducted a hearing. In light of that  
19 ruling and the associated hearing, Defendants submit that another hearing is unnecessary  
20 to resolve Defendants' motion to stay and that the Court should proceed to a ruling.

21 Notably, Plaintiffs do not claim *any* prejudice from an expedited hearing, nor could  
22 they. Plaintiffs' opposition is due tomorrow, November 8, under the Local Rules, so  
REPLY IN SUPP. OF MOTION TO EXPEDITE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
1100 L St. NW, Washington, DC, 20003  
(202) 305-7664

1 granting Defendants' motion will have no impact whatsoever on Plaintiffs, and will  
2 simply expedite a ruling on this matter. Therefore, Plaintiffs' opposition appears to be  
3 based on nothing more than their desire to delay a ruling on the motion to stay. Plaintiffs'  
4 apparent belief that a delayed ruling may somehow benefit their litigation position does  
5 not provide a reason to deny expedited treatment.

6 Given the harms and other issues identified in Defendants' motion, Defendants  
7 respectfully request that the Court rule on the motion to stay by November 14, 2019, after  
8 which Defendants intend to seek relief in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.  
9 Defendants waive their right under the Local Rules to file a reply in support of their  
10 motion to stay.

11 Dated: November 7, 2019

Respectfully submitted,

12 JOSEPH H. HUNT  
Assistant Attorney General

13 ALEXANDER K. HAAS  
Branch Director

14 s/ Joshua M. Kolsky  
15 ERIC J. SOSKIN  
16 Senior Trial Counsel  
17 KERI L. BERMAN  
18 KUNTAL V. CHOLERA  
JOSHUA M. KOLSKY, DC Bar No. 993430  
19 Trial Attorneys  
United States Department of Justice  
20 Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch  
1100 L Street NW  
21 Washington, D.C. 20005  
Tel: (202) 305-7664  
22 Fax: (202) 616-8470

REPLY IN SUPP. OF MOTION TO EXPEDITE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
1100 L St. NW, Washington, DC, 20003  
(202) 305-7664

joshua.kolsky@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Defendants

REPLY IN SUPP. OF MOTION TO EXPEDITE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
1100 L St. NW, Washington, DC, 20003  
(202) 305-7664

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on November 7, 2019, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system, which will send notification of such filing to all users receiving ECF notices for this case.

/s/ Joshua M. Kolsky

United States Department of Justice  
Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch  
1100 L Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20005

Attorney for Defendants